

Amendments to the Claims:

The listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application.

Listing of Claims:

1-4. (Canceled).

5. (Previously Presented) A method for triggering a restraint device, comprising:

triggering the restraint device as a function of a collision signal; and

initiating the triggering when the collision signal exceeds a noise threshold, wherein a time required for the collision signal to exceed the noise threshold is taken into account in determining a triggering time for the restraint device.

6. (Previously Presented) The method as recited in Claim 5, wherein the triggering time is taken into account by a fixed offset.

7. (Previously Presented) The method as recited in Claim 5, further comprising:

determining the triggering time as a function of a collision velocity and a crash type.

8. (Previously Presented) The method as recited in Claim 7, further comprising:

determining the collision velocity via a pre-crash sensor.

9. (New) The method as recited in Claim 7, further comprising:

determining the triggering time as a function of a collision velocity and a crash type, wherein the triggering time is taken into account by a fixed offset.

10. (New) The method as recited in Claim 9, further comprising:

determining the collision velocity via a pre-crash sensor.

Still further, it is respectfully submitted that the “Eisele” reference does not identically disclose (or even suggest) the feature of “initiating the triggering when the collision signal exceeds a noise threshold, in which *a time required for the collision signal to exceed the noise threshold is taken into account* in determining a triggering time for the restraint device,” as provided for in the context of claim 5. The Office Action refers to calculating the trigger time when received accident signals are greater than a predefined threshold, but the “Eisele” reference doesn’t disclose the feature of accounting for *a time required for the collision signal to exceed the noise threshold*, as provided for in the context of claim 5.

Accordingly, claim 5 is allowable, as are its dependent claims 7 and 8.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the “Eisele” reference.

Claim 6 depends from claim 5, and is therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 5, since the “Eisele” references are not prior art.

New claims 9 and 10 do not add any new matter and are supported by the present application, including the specification. Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 5, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons.

In summary, claims 5 to 10 are allowable.